



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,112	03/07/2006	Ji Young Bae	K-0761	2993
34610	7590	12/10/2008	EXAMINER	
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			TRIEU, THERESA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3748			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/10/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/560,112	BAE ET AL.
	Examiner Theresa Trieu	Art Unit 3748

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug. 29, 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24,33-42,49 and 130-135 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-48 and 71 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24,33-42,49 and 130-135 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on Dec. 9, 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Dec. 9, 2005

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to the applicants' election filed on Aug. 29, 2008.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the Figs. 1-8 and 12-15, claims 1-24, 33-42, 49 and 130-135 being readable thereon, in the reply filed on Aug. 29, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the claims recite several limitations which are mutually exclusive to the different species as noted by the examiner in the Restriction Requirement mailed on July 30, 2008. Examining all of these numerous distinct features of the entire application would place a serious burden on the Examiner. The search required for any one of the species would not be required for the remaining species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 43-48 and 71 belong to species disclosed in Figs. 9-11; therefore, the examiner has not examined these claims. The examiner has examined claims 1-24, 33-42, 49 and 130-135 which read on the elected species of Figs. 1-8 and 12-15. Accordingly, claims 43-48 and 71 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "lower cap 5" (see Figs. 1, 16, 29 and 40 – see page 8, line 26); "second valve 220" (see page 19, line 18). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "27c" has been used to designate both "suction port"(page 12, line 22, page 28, line 19 and page 31, line 16) and "suction valve" (page 60, line 1). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phrasology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 23, line 4, "second discharge port 27b" should be changed to -- second discharge port 26b --; page 34, line 22, "suction valves 27a,b,c" should be changed to -- suction ports 27a,b,c --; page 58, line 9, "first and second suction ports 26a and 26b" should be changed to -- first and second suction ports 27a and 27b --. Appropriate correction is required.

7. Also, applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification due to the lengthy specification.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-24, 33-42, 49 and 130-135 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24, 33-42, 49 and 51 of copending Application No. 10/560,084 in view of Sawai et al. (Sawai) (U.S. Patent Number 3,723,024).

Regarding claims 1-24, 33-42, 49 and 130-135, the copending Application '084 discloses a rotary compressor for use in a closed container having an electric element and a rotary compression element having two different compression capacities in clockwise and counterclockwise directions, the rotary compression element comprising: a driving shaft, a cylinder, a vane installed elastically in the cylinder to contact the roller, upper and lower bearings installed in upper and lower portions of the cylinder, suction and discharge ports communicating with the fluid chamber so as to suck and discharge the fluid; a compression mechanism is formed different sizes of compressive spaces in the fluid chamber depending on the rotational direction of the driving shaft; a valve assembly rotating according to the rotational direction of the driving shaft comprising first and second valves, control means for controlling a rotation angle of the first valve; the first valve further comprising first, second and third openings and first, second and third suction ports; the control means having a curved groove formed at the first valve and having a predetermined length; and a stopper formed on the beating and inserted into the curved groove. However, the copending Application '084 fails to disclose a suction plenum communicating with the suction ports.

Regarding claims 1 and 130-135, as shown in Figs. 1, 4 and 7, Sawai teaches that it is conventional in the rotary compressor art to utilize a suction plenum 33 communicating with the suction ports 11 and preliminarily storing, the fluid; the suction plenum 33 accommodates oil separated from the stored fluid; the suction plenum 33 is installed at a lower portion of the bearing 14 in the vicinity of the suction port 11; the suction plenum 33 being connected with a suction pipe 18 through a predetermined fluid passage, the suction pipe 18 supplying the fluid to be compressed; the fluid passage penetrates the cylinder and the lower bearing; the suction plenum 33 further comprises a penetration hole through which a sleeve of the lower bearing 14 passes. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the suction plenum, as taught by Sawai in the copending Application '084 apparatus, since the use thereof would have improved the performance and efficiency of the vane pump device.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 19, 38 and 135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "the bearing" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether applicants are claiming "*upper bearing 24*" or "*lower bearing 25*".

Prior Art

10. The IDS (PTO-1449) filed on Dec. 9, 2005 has been considered. An initialized copy is attached hereto.
11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and consists of two patents: Pandeya et al. (Pandeya) (Patent Number 4,577,472) and Bac et al. (Publication Number KR 2005062217), each further discloses a state of the art.

Conclusion

12. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP §2163.06 II(A), MPEP §2163.06 and MPEP §714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa Trieu whose telephone number is 571-272-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am- 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TT

/Theresa Trieu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748